

REMARKS:

The applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the examining attorney and to further clarify the claims, without adding any new matter; and in so doing addresses all issues raised by the examining attorney in the Office Action.

I. **In the Claims**

Claims 1-12 were rejected in the office action under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter claimed.

The Office Action noted that in claim 1, at line 5 and 7, the phrase “the adjustment ring” lacked an antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the term adjustment ring refers to the “Twist up adjustment ring.”

The Office Action further noted that in claim 1, line 9, there was no antecedent basis for the term “said adjustment grooves.” Applicant has amended claim 1 to further clarify the antecedent basis is said “at least one adjustment groove”.

The Office Action noted that in claim 2, line 5, that it was not clear whether the phrase “a set adjustment grove” related to the “at least one Twist Up adjustment groove, suggesting “a set” be replaced with -the-, if accurate. Applicant has amended the claim as suggested to further clarify the claim.

The Office Action further noted in claim 2, line 6, that if the phrase “a set” were replaced with --adjustment-- that lines 1-8 would be understood. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested to further clarify the claim.

The Office Action further noted that in claim 2, lines 10-16, that the claim would be clearer if "a set groove direction" and "a direction of the set movement groove" were changed to --a direction of said adjustment groove-- and --a direction of said adjustment groove--, respectively. Applicant has amended claim 2 as suggested to further clarify the claim.

Finally, the Office Action suggested that claim 2, lines 10 and 13, should be amended to address the informalities regarding capitalization, which has been so amended by the applicant.

Furthermore, applicant has amended dependent claims 5 through 12 claims in accordance with the amendments suggested as to the independent claims 1 and 2, and to provide further clarification to the dependent claims.

IV Conclusion

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to further clarify the invention claimed. Specifically, without adding new matter, applicant has amended the claims to provide the necessary antecedent basis for each of the elements. Applicant submits that the application as amended should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of September, 2005.



Edwin S. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,044



CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

Date of Deposit: September 13, 2005

I, Edwin S. Wall, hereby certify that on the 13th day of September, 2005, I deposited the RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION, attached hereto, with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dated this 13th day of September, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edwin S. Wall".

Edwin S. Wall
Registered Patent Attorney